THE IDEAL KING OF JUDAH

At the outset of any adequate study of Old Testament Messianism, one is compelled to recognise that contemporary discussion of the subject has been drawn irrevocably into the sphere of comparative religion. The Messiah is the ideal Davidic king, the son of David, that is to say, in whom David's kingship is to achieve its final plenitude and permanency. That being the case, what does kingship as an institution really signify? The answers that have been suggested to this vital question over the past fifty years have usually been in terms of analogies drawn from the profane records of the Ancient Near East. What did kingship signify for Israel's older, greater and more cultured neighbours, the Egyptians, the Babylonians, the Canaanites, the Hittites? How far did Israel derive her ideal of kingship from these peoples, and how far did she modify and adapt that idea, so as to fit it into the framework of her own sacred traditions?

Our starting-point for the investigation of this question must be Israel's own consciousness of having been chosen by Yahweh, and of his choice having been made permanent and irrevocable by the covenant. The *singleness* of Yahweh and the *exclusiveness* of Israel's relationship with him lie at the very roots of Old Testament religion.[1] Israel herself at this early stage exists as an *amphictyony*, a loose confederation of tribes united by common origin and blood-ties, common traditions and a common tongue, but above all bound by the covenant to the exclusive worship of one God, Yahweh.[2] At the feast of covenant-renewal (originally celebrated at Shechem) the members of the confederation assemble at the covenant-shrine of the ark, to relive in cultic terms the history in which Yahweh first became their God and they became his people.[3] In this way the three great feasts of the Canaanite agricultural year acquire historical connotations for Israel,

[1] cf. M. Noth, 'Die sachlichen Voraussetzungen der vorexilischen Gesetze' in *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, 1957, pp. 70–1
[2] cf. M. Noth, *Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels*, 1930 and R. de Vaux, *Les Institutions de l'Ancien Testament*, I, 1958, pp. 21, 143ff.
[3] cf. H.-J. Kraus, *Das Volk Gottes im Alten Testament*, 1957, p. 16, and also H. Grönbech, *The Culture of the Teutons*, II (Eng. trans.), 1931, p. 185 : 'Step by step the occasional feasts led up to the annual cult-feasts, which constituted fixed points in existence, where life was regularly renewed and made into a future.'

and become the sacred moments at which she reactualises in the presence of her covenant-God the events of the exodus and of Sinai. As H.-J. Kraus puts it, 'The Sinai Covenant is rendered present and brought near in the "Today" of the community's cult.'[1] The community *encounters* the covenant-God anew and renews its *response*, the 'all-embracing response' of religion to the revelation of His holiness. This holiness of her covenant-God is the sole source for Israel of the strength and guidance, the elemental light and life she needs in order to thrust back her enemies, and to achieve security and prosperity, peace and fertility. These come to her as Yahweh's covenant blessings, epitomised in the two ideas of *ṣedaqah* and *šalôm*.[2]

The distinctive quality of the God of Israel is His *justice, ṣedaqah*,[3] which is initially revealed to Israel at Sinai in the form of *torah*, law. This law is preserved, promulgated and applied in particular cases by the judge.[4] The judges seem to have been foremost among the ancient leaders of Israel, guardians of tradition, leaders in war, arbitrators, and discoverers of wells, achieving their status either by family rank or by native ability or by feats of valour.[5] Together with the Levite,[6] it is

[1] H.-J. Kraus, *Gottesdienst in Israel*, 1954, p. 53. Also cf. M. Noth, *Gesammelte Studien*, pp. 214–15, on the inevitable 'cyclic' mentality which entered Israel from the Canaanite nature religion, when the *Ackerbaufeste* were taken over, though these were now interpreted as referring to Israel's own past.

[2] Strictly speaking this might be regarded as an anachronism. The expression *ṣedaqah* seems to have been adopted by the israelites from the Canaanites at the time of the first kings (cf. H. Cazelles, 'A propos de quelques textes difficiles relatifs à la justice de Dieu dans l'Ancien Testament,' *Revue Biblique*, 1951, p. 187). *Šlm* occurs repeatedly in the Ras-Shamra texts as the name of a Canaanite divinity (cf. C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Handbook*, 1947, pp. 17, 12, 52) and variants of the same root occur in Akkadian divine names. It is particularly interesting to find H. Cazelles (art. cit., p. 186) referring to a divine name *ṣdqšlm*, in which both roots are combined—and particularly exasperating to find oneself unable to trace the reference !

[3] Most recent commentators emphasise that *ṣedaqah* signifies *not* an abstract norm but a personal relationship (*Gemeinschaftsverhältnis*) ; cf. G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, 1957, pp. 368ff., and especially H. Cazelles (art. cit., p. 175) : ' . . . non pas les vertus humaines d'équité et de respect du droit, mais l'effet d'une providence et d'un secours divin assurant la bonne marche et la paix dans les sociétés humaines . . . la bonne marche et l'harmonie du tout. . . .'

[4] This is the function of the 'institutional' judge as distinct from the *charismatic* 'holy war' leader. It is the Deuteronomist school that has extended the designation 'judge' to this latter type as well, combining ancient lists of 'institutional' judges with tribal hero tales (*Stammesheldenerzählungen*) in the book of Judges (cf. M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 2nd ed., 1957, pp. 47ff.), because in fact the two distinct functions were sometimes combined in the one person, notably in the case of Jephtah (cf. Noth, *Amt und Berufung im alten Testament*, 1958, pp. 20–2). On the function of the 'institutional' type of judge to whom 'the law was entrusted,' and especially 'apodictic law,' cf. Kraus, *Gottesdienst*, pp. 64–5. He describes him as a 'covenant-mediator' (*Bundesmittler*).

[5] cf. Van der Ploeg, 'Les Chefs du Peuple d'Israel et leurs Titres,' in *Revue Biblique*, 1950, pp. 42–51

[6] On the function of the Levite in early Israelite society as preacher and in relation to the 'Holy War' tradition, cf. G. von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, 1953, especially pp. 66–7 ; cf. also M. Weber, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionsoziologie*, III, 1923,

the judge's function to see that the 'justice' of the covenant-God is reproduced in the lives of the people. He is, to that extent, an upholder of the covenant, a 'covenant-mediator.'

This 'institutional' type of judge must be distinguished from the *charismatic* type of judge or leader raised up by Yahweh in times of disaster or oppression to save Israel.[1] When any one tribe is attacked, all or most of the others send their menfolk to her defence as a matter of sacred duty. The army of the covenant people fights in the power of the covenant-God's holiness.[2] In such emergencies certain individuals (usually Yahweh's choice seems to have fallen on rather improbable ones) are suddenly seized by Yahweh's spirit and endowed with supernatural strength and skill to lead their fellow Israelites in a 'holy war,' to destroy the enemy of the moment, and to restore some part at least of the tribal confederation to a state of *ṣedaqah* and *šalôm*. The two blessings which the covenant-God by His very presence bestows on the confederation are now mediated to her through a charismatic chief. Here we encounter the charism of the Spirit in its most primitive form. It 'comes mightily' upon the subject concerned, possesses his physical faculties, 'changes him into another man,' and so uses him to destroy the enemies of Israel. Primarily therefore he is a warrior and leader in the holy war. But it seems probable that by extension the individual judge was considered 'inspired' in his administration of justice too for the rest of his life.[3] Thereafter his line quickly died out.

The charismatic judge was essentially a crisis figure.[4] He was raised up in moments of exceptional danger to deal with a specific enemy, whom he usually routed in one specific 'holy war.' But the attacks of the Philistines in the latter part of the period of Judges constituted a menace that was different in kind, more intense and far more sustained. To meet this new threat a new and more permanent form of leadership was needed. So it was that Saul, the charismatic

---

[1] cf. Kraus, *Das Volk Gottes im alten Testament*, pp. 25–6

[2] cf. G. von Rad, *Der heilige Krieg im alten Israel*, 1951, and M. Noth, *Amt und Berufung*, p. 17

[3] cf. M. Noth, *Amt und Berufung im alten Testament*, pp. 21–2, on the combination of charismatic leadership with judging. However it must be pointed out that *thpt*, the Ugaritic equivalent of Hebrew *šopeṭ* (judge) designates a warrior champion ; cf. J. Gray, ' Texts from Ras Shamra,' in *Documents from Old Testament Times* (D. Winton-Thomas ed.), 1958, pp. 129, 131.

[4] cf. Kraus, *Das Volk Gottes im alten Testament*, p. 26

---

pp. 185ff. (' chaplains,' directors of conscience, *guru* priests, etc.), and A. Neher, ' Fonction du Prophète dans la Société Hébraique,' in *R.H.P.R.*, 1948–9, pp. 30–42 (esp. on ' levitisme, incarnation sociale definie du berith,' pp. 38ff.).

leader of the time, was raised to a leadership that was permanent and continuous, in response to a menace that had become endemic.

From this moment onwards throughout the period of the monarchy the problem for the king was how to reconcile the new institution vested in his person with the old ' amphictyonic ' structure of Israel's society, as formulated in her sacred traditions.[1] Did those traditions, so jealously guarded as they were by the ' institutional ' judges, admit of the possibility of kingship in any recognisable sense ? It was Saul's failure to solve this problem, to achieve this vital reconciliation between the old and the new, that led ultimately to his downfall. When after his victory over the Amalekites he erected a trophy and kept the best of the spoil, he was arrogating to himself the prerogatives of a king in the profane sense, and so violating the tradition of the covenant. It was left to another king, more *faithful* as well as more adroit, to succeed where he had failed.[2]

Yet even David had his desperate moments, moments at which reactionaries or rebels, taking advantage of some temporary discontent among their fellow Israelites, would seek to overthrow the new monarchy and to re-establish the old amphictyonic constitution.

> We have no part in David,
> No inheritance in the son of Jesse,
> Every man to his tent, O Israel ! (2 Sam. 20:1 ; 1 Kg. 12:16)

This was the traditional rallying cry by which successive rebels incited the northern (and more conservative) faction to revolt. It was in effect an appeal to reject the new upstart monarchy, and to restore in their pristine integrity the ancient traditions of the amphictyony. The reactionaries failed and David succeeded ; that in itself showed that ' Yahweh was with David,' just as David in his ' faithfulness ' proved that he was ' with Yahweh.' Yet the anti-monarchist ' traditionalism ' has left an indelible stamp on the pages of the Old Testament, and has made its own contribution, of permanent significance, to the total message.[3]

David succeeded where Saul had failed. Yahweh was with him, supporting him with strength and guidance and at the same time making events play into his hands in such a way that his kingship seemed not merely reconcilable with, but actually rooted in the traditions of the amphictyony. The ark, the shrine of the covenant-God's

---

[1] cf. Kraus, *Gottesdienst in Israel*, pp. 69ff.
[2] cf. ibid., pp. 70–1. ' David attached to himself the ancient Israelite traditions by bringing the ark and the tabernacle of Yahweh to Jerusalem, and founding his kingdom on the basis of the sacral-cultic traditions of the amphictyony, which were derived from the ark and tabernacle.' [3] cf. R. de Vaux, op. cit., pp. 145–6, 152–3

presence, was the focal point in which those traditions were centred. As long as this shrine was in Ephraim, Ephraim was supreme among the twelve tribes. But when Shiloh was sacked the ark was captured by the Philistines. Ephraim had utterly betrayed her trust. And when the ark returned to Israelite territory it turned miraculously not northwards but southwards, and chose of its own accord a town of Judah as its temporary resting-place.

> He forsook the tabernacle of Shiloh,
> the tent which he pitched among men,
> Moreover he refused the tent of Joseph,
> And chose not the tribe of Ephraim,
> But chose the tribe of Judah . . . (Ps. 78:67–8)

Some fifty years later, by his God-given strength and skill, David conquered the Jebusite city of Jerusalem. The significance of this victory must be appreciated. From the time of Joshua onwards, Jerusalem had been a cardinal point in the Canaanite resistance, holding out against all attacks, and to a very large extent cutting Judah off from her more powerful brethren in the north.[1] Now David brings his victorious career to a climax by entering this hitherto unconquered stronghold in triumph, at the head of the united armies of Judah and the north.[2] Adherents of the southern kingdom did not fail to interpret this and other victories of David as a final fulfilment, long delayed, of Yahweh's ancient promise to give the promised land to his people in its entirety.[3] Moreover its geographical situation on neutral territory between north and south made it ideally suitable as the capital of the new united kingdom.[4] But the seal was set on David's triumph when the ark, the shrine of the amphictyony, showed by a series of miracles that it had 'chosen' Jerusalem as its new and permanent home. By conducting the ark in triumph into the Jebusite city he had conquered, David made it the sacred city of the tribal amphictyony. At the same time he himself became the divinely appointed guardian of the shrine and upholder of the traditions of the amphictyony.[5]

It is plausible to suppose that the city which David had taken had been for many generations a Jebusite sacred city, and that its king had been a priest-king. Melchisedech, king of Salem, priest of El Elyon (Gen. 14:18f.), was such a priest-king. Abraham had acknowledged

---

[1] cf. D. Baldi, P. Lemaire, *Atlante Biblico*, 1955, pp. 100, 117
[2] 2 Sam 5:6ff. R. de Vaux (*Les Livres de Samuel* BJ, Paris 1953, p. 153) notes that the conquest of Jerusalem took place *after* the conquests of the Philistines mentioned subsequently in the text.
[3] cf. G. von Rad, *Das erste Buch Mose* ATD, 1956, pp. 21–2
[4] cf. A. R. Johnson, *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel*, 1955, pp. 28–9
[5] cf. Kraus, *Gottesdienst in Israel*, pp. 70ff.

his priesthood by offering him tithes, and Melchisedek on his part had identified his god, El Elyon, with the God who had bestowed victory on Abraham. In the messianic psalm the heir of David is regarded as in some sense heir to the royal priesthood of Melchisedech. 'Thou art a priest for ever in the line of Melchisedech' (Ps. 110:4). It seems therefore that when he made this Jebusite sacred city the sacred city of the Israelite covenant-shrine, David, instead of abolishing Jebusite sacred institutions, adapted some of them to the true worship of Yahweh Sebaoth.[1] It is possible that the names of two of David's sons, Solomon and Absolom, contain adapted forms of the primitive name of the city Salem,[2] and it has been suggested that Zadok, the non-Aaronic priest of David, may originally have been a Jebusite priest of the shrine, converted to Yahwism and allowed to retain his priesthood,[3] for the text ascribing Aaronic descent to Zadok in 1 Chron. 5:29-34 ; 6:35-8 may be referring to adoption rather than natural descent.[4] But in particular David may have adapted the old Jebusite tradition of priest-kingship and made it, in some mitigated sense, the expression of his own new role as guardian of the ark and upholder of the covenant. In this way elements in the Jebusite royal ideology may have been adopted by the Israelite king and so have become the expression of his kingship. But it is clear that the sacred nature of that kingship derived wholly from Yahweh of the covenant and not from the Jebusite traditions ; they provided only the material expression of it.

Henceforward then, the king's function as charismatic mediator of Yahweh's *ṣedaqah* and *šalôm* could be restated in dramatic terms, taken over from the Jebusite cultic traditions. Cultic myths and sagas would have been found ready to hand, which had once been used to celebrate the conquest of chaos, darkness and death by the pagan god of fertility and life. Now they are used to express the ideal king's function in the Israelite community. Israel's Gentile foes are identified with the forces of death and darkness,[5] and the king becomes, under Yahweh, the all-conquering mediator of light and life, strength and fertility, 'the lamp of Israel' (2 Sam. 21:17), 'the breath of our nostrils' (Lam. 4:20), an *'elohîm* (supernatural being) of more than earthly power (Ps. 45:7). He is to 'judge the poor of the people, save the needy, and break in

[1] cf. A. R. Johnson, op. cit., pp. 29ff.   [2] cf. ibid., p. 46, n. 2
[3] cf. ibid., p. 46, n. 1
[4] For the difficulties involved in ascribing Aaronic descent to Zadok cf. R. de Vaux, *Les Livres de Samuel*, p. 166.
[5] cf. A. Bentzen, 'King Ideology—" Urmensch "—" Tronbestijgingsfeest ",' in *Studia Theologica Lund*, III, ii, 1951-2, on Ps. 46:4, 7. The enemies of Ps. 46:7 are the chaos powers of v. 4, and consequently of Ps. 2, which are actualised in the ' nations.' The ' actual political ' situation at the accession of a new king of which Mowinckel speaks is viewed as the threatening outbreak of the ' Flood ' (p. 153).

pieces the rod of the oppressor' (Ps. 72:4, cf. 21:9–13), winning ever-lasting victory and peace. 'In his days the just shall flourish, abundance of šalôm to last while the moon endures' (Ps. 72:7). The ideal king is to be a source of fruitfulness in the natural order too. 'He shall come down like rain on mown grass, like showers that water the earth' (Ps. 71:6). In this sense, and to an extent which it is difficult to define, Israel seems to have drawn on the 'king ideology' of the Canaanites. It seems reasonable to suppose that it was at this stage in her history that she began to absorb this 'king ideology' into her own tradition.

It becomes inevitable at this point to refer to Mowinckel's brilliant, though precarious hypothesis, definitively restated for English readers a few years ago in his *He That Cometh*.[1] The theory is too well known to require more than a brief recapitulation here. Working mainly from the analogy of Babylonian kingship and the role assumed by the Babylonian king in the New Year *akitu* festival, Mowinckel visualises the Israelite king as playing a similar role in an (hypothetical) Israelite New Year feast, and so performing a similar function in Israelite society. This Israelite New Year festival would have been a ritual re-enactment of Yahweh's victory over the forces of chaos and death, and of His triumphant enthronement, by which creation was renewed, and fertility, prosperity and security were ensured for the coming year. Embodying in his own person, as he did, the life of the community as a whole, the king was at the same time most intimately associated (though never identified) with Yahweh Himself in this supreme creative moment of the festival. Through the cultic drama of the feast in which he played the leading part, the whole community actually experienced Yahweh's primordial victory and enthronement, and actually received through him, their king, the fruits of that victory in the form of *ṣedaqah* and *šalôm*, God-given harmony and justice, elemental life-force issuing in security, fertility, power over enemies and prosperity in every sphere of life. Mowinckel emphasises, however, certain radical modifications which this ritual pattern of renewal had to undergo before it could become in any sense an expression of Yahwistic religion. 'To the renewal of nature there has been added another element of increasing importance, the renewal of history. It is the divine acts of election and deliverance in the actual history of Israel which are relived in the festival,'[2] and again, 'What the king obtains in the cultic festival is not primarily new life and strength, but the renewal and confirmation of the covenant, which is based on Yahweh's election and faithfulness,

---

[1] Oxford 1956, index references under 'New Year Feast'; cf. also A. R. Johnson's excellent summary in *The Old Testament and Modern Study* (H. H. Rowley ed.), 1951.

[2] S. Mowinckel, op. cit., p. 82

and depends upon the king's religious and moral virtues and constancy.' [1]

It is certainly true that the great Israelite festivals seem to have included ritual and dramatic re-enactments of the past. The feasts of Passover and Tabernacles are obvious and explicit examples, and the triumphant entry of the ark into Jerusalem is another episode that seems to have been 'reactualised' in a commemorative feast. Mowinckel deduces this convincingly from the text of Ps. 132. 'The institution of the cult of Yahweh in Jerusalem, and the first entry of Yahweh and the ark into the city are here enacted. The king assumes the role not of Yahweh but of David. He appears at the head of the Israelite army, seeking the ark which had been lost in the conflict with the Philistines, and brings it up in triumph to Jerusalem to its place in the temple.' [2] To these and perhaps to certain other examples, Grönbech's words may reasonably be applied : 'The present re-enacting is as primary as the first acting ; and the participants are not witnesses to the deed of some hero or god . . . but simply and literally the original heroes who send fateful deeds into the world.' [3] But none of the festivals involved in these examples amounts to a New Year feast according to the general Oriental pattern. For a festival of this sort in Israel there is no *historical* evidence. Moreover the *paleoanthropological* evidence which Mowinckel attempts to deduce from the so-called 'enthronement psalms' [4] is almost certainly invalid. Gunkel had long ago advanced the most cogent arguments for ascribing a late date to this group of psalms, and in particular regarded their dependence upon Deutero–Isaiah as ' undeniable ' (*unverkennbar*).[5] His arguments have never been adequately met, and recently they have been very forcibly restated by Feuillet,[6] Kraus [7] and Tournay.[8] These psalms must in effect belong to a period when the first temple no longer existed, and when a direct relation to its cult of the kind which Mowinckel visualises was no longer possible.

We must now turn to consider the actual process by which Saul

---

[1] S. Mowinckel, op. cit., p. 82 ; cf. also the same author's *Religion und Kultus*, 1953, pp. 72–3.

[2] cf. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, p. 83. Actually most commentators infer a ' cultic ' re-enactment of this sort. cf. Cales, *Le Livre des Psaumes*, II, 1936, pp. 506–7, and especially A. Bentzen, ' Cultic Use of the Story of the Ark,' in *JBL.*, 1948.

[3] cf. V. Grönbech, *Culture of the Teutons*, II, 1931, p. 222

[4] Pss. 47, 93, 96–9 ; cf. 29, 68, 95, 100, 149. For refutations of Mowinckel's theory on this point cf. H.-J. Kraus, *Gottesdienst in Israel*, p. 97, and also (with particular reference to the expression ' YHWH mlk ') Diethelm Michel, ' Studien zu den sogenannten Thronbesteigungspsalmen,' in *Vetus Testamentum*, 1956, pp. 40–68.

[5] cf. H. Gunkel-J. Begrich, *Einleitung in die Psalmen*, pp. 80ff.

[6] In *Nouvelle Revue Theologique*, March–April 1951, pp. 242–60, 352–63

[7] *Gottesdienst in Israel*, pp. 103ff.

[8] *Revue Biblique*, 1956, p. 130, and 1958, pp. 324–5

was inaugurated into kingship. It was extremely complex, and its complexity is not lessened by the fact that we have two divergent accounts of it.[1] In the earlier account Saul is ' recognised ' as the elect of Yahweh by Samuel, the seer of Ramah, and then anointed. In the second he is chosen by Samuel the judge at Mizpah and then popularly acclaimed.[2] The inauguration of David is, if anything, rather more complicated. In his youth he is prophetically designated as king by Samuel and then privately anointed.[3] Long afterwards, when his prowess as a warrior leader has been established, he is anointed as king at Hebron on two separate occasions : first by the men of Judah,[4] secondly by all the elders of Israel.[5] It is essential therefore, in the case of these first two kings, carefully to distinguish between two separate inaugurations for each. The first comes from the God of Israel, and is charismatic, vocational and private. The second comes from the men of Israel, and is institutional, official and public. Both ' coronations ' are conferred by the same rite, a rite borrowed from Israel's profane neighbours. When the men of Israel use it, they intend in effect to confer on David a position in the Israelite community analogous to that held by the king in pagan societies.[6] When Yahweh uses it through his prophet He elevates it into a sacramental, and by it bestows in a new and more permanent mode the ancient charism of the spirit. From whom then did the Israelites borrow the anointing rite ? Noth emphasises that it is known neither from Egyptian nor from Mesopotamian records, but is referred to precisely in the Canaanite Tell-el-Amarna letters.[7] The Canaanite kinglet, Adu-nirari reminds his overlord, Thutmoses III, of an occasion when ' Manhabi(r)ia the king of Egypt, thy grandfather, established (Taku) my (grandfather) as king in Nuhashshe, and set oil upon his head.' [8] Here, Noth maintains, the Pharaoh, in instituting a subordinate kinglet, would have been condescending to the established Syrian-Palestinian coronation ritual. On the other hand, though the Pharaohs themselves were not anointed on their accession, they are known to have instituted their high officials by means of this rite.[9] Another, and possibly more remote origin for the rite may be the Hittite ceremonial.[10] For Hittite coronations involved first anointing with ' the fine oil of kingship,'

---

[1] (a) 1 Sam. 9:16, 10:10, 24, 11:5–11 (pro-monarchist), (b) 1 Sam. 8, 10:17–24, 12 (anti-monarchist). cf. R. de Vaux, Les Livres de Samuel, pp. 44–5.

[2] 1 Sam. 10:17–24. On the secondary and secular significance of the acclamation, cf. M. Noth, Geschichte Israels, 1950, p. 148, and H.-J. Kraus, Gottesdienst in Israel, p. 69.

[3] 1 Sam. 16 : 12–13   [4] 2 Sam. 2:4   [5] 2 Sam. 5:3

[6] cf. 1 Sam. 8:19

[7] cf. M. Noth, Amt und Berufung im Alten Testament, pp. 14–15

[8] Cited by A. R. Johnson, op. cit., p. 12, n. 3

[9] cf. R. de Vaux, Les Institutions de l'Ancien Testament, p. 161

[10] cf. M. Noth, Amt und Berufung im Alten Testament, p. 15

8

and then a solemn ritual summons to the kingship. Thereafter
'Anointed one' became one of the titles of the Hittite king.[1] Signifi-
cantly too, in the Hittite ritual, it is not only the emperor who is
anointed but, as Noth points out, the 'puppet king' (*Ersatzkönig*) as
well.[2]

The legitimacy of interpreting Israelite kingship in terms of
Mesopotamian 'king ideology' is thus seriously called in question.
Was the Israelite king ever intended to be more than Yahweh's
'puppet king' or 'kinglet'? Was not kingship in Israel conceived
of rather after the pattern of the 'kinglets' of Canaanite city-states in
the Egyptian or Hittite empires? In so far as one can draw analogies
from human institutions, was not the ideal relationship of the Israelite
king to Yahweh that of a Canaanite 'kinglet' to his imperial over-
lord? A very few kings would have conformed to the ideal pattern,
accepting the position of subordinate 'kinglet' in relation to Yahweh,
and with loyal devotion using their authority to implement the terms
of His covenant. Most kings would have arrogated to themselves in a
greater or lesser degree kingship in the fuller and more profane sense,
and to this extent conformed to the Mesopotamian pattern rather than
to the Canaanite one, thus being false to the orthodox ideal. For
though the subordinate position of the king in relation to his god is
emphasised in Mesopotamian texts,[3] he is still a far more important
figure than the Israelite king or the Canaanite 'kinglet.'

What was the significance of anointing itself? Oil was usually
considered in some sense life-giving, and in the coronation anointing
the king was thought to receive divine life-force into his own person.[4]
In Israel, as we have seen, this divine life-force was the ancient charism
of the spirit, bestowed in greater plenitude than in the days of the
Judges. As a result the king was at this point separated from the rest
of men, drawn into the sphere of holiness which pertained to the
covenant-God, and made the mediating source of the elemental
covenant blessing of *ṣedaqah* and *šalôm*. Henceforward the king
'belonged' to Yahweh the covenant-God in roughly the same sense
that a sacred cult object, a sacred stone or altar, was conceived to
belong to Him. These too were consecrated by anointing, and were

[1] cf. R. de Vaux, *Les Institutions de l'Ancien Testament*, pp. 161–2
[2] cf. M. Noth, *Amt und Berufung im Alten Testament*, p. 31, n. 29
[3] cf. S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, pp. 33–4. The theory that the relationship
between the Israelite king and Yahweh was roughly analogous to that between the
Canaanite vassal 'kinglet' and the Hittite emperor is strengthened when we consider
that the form of the Israelite covenant resembles most closely the 'Hittite suzerainty
treaty' instituted between Hittite overlords and vassal 'kinglets.' cf. G. Mendenhall,
Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East, 1955, esp. pp. 25ff.
[4] cf. M. Noth, *Amt und Berufung im Alten Testament*, pp. 15–16, and R. de Vaux,
Les Institutions de l'Ancien Testament, pp. 160–4

pregnant with the divine life-force of Yahweh's presence and use. In a similar way and for a similar reason the anointed king was 'untouchable.'[1]

A further element of supreme theological significance is Yahweh's covenant with the house of David, originally promulgated in the oracle of Nathan (2 Sam. 7:8–16). It has only recently been realised how closely this oracle conforms in style, form and content to a certain type of Egyptian coronation text known as the *Königsnovelle*.[2] The *Königsnovelle* purports to predict in conventional Egyptian 'court style' an ideal programme for the new Pharaoh's future reign. It contains references to the king 'sitting in his palace,' forming a plan to build a new temple for the divinity, being received into divine sonship, and so having his reign confirmed and established 'everlastingly.' It will be apparent that Nathan's oracle, at least in what seems to have been its primitive form, follows the sequence of the *Königsnovelle* almost clause for clause, while at the same time modifying its elements radically so as to adapt it to existing Israelite theology. In particular 'divine sonship' in Israel is reduced to adoption. The king does not in any sense acquire a divine nature. Another document, closely related to the first in ancient Egyptian king ideology, is the 'royal protocol' or charter for the new king's reign.[3] This protocol contained the new names conferred on the Pharaoh at his accession, the affirmation of his divine sonship and of his power. It was conceived to have been written by the divinity himself, and was ceremonially handed to the new king at his coronation. It seems probable that the handing over of a similar sacred charter constituted an important element in the coronation ceremony in Judah too. The document referred to as *'edut* 'testament' (Ps. 89:40) or *berît* 'covenant' (Ps. 132:12) or *ḥoq* 'decree' (Ps. 2:7) appears to be such a charter, a renewal of that originally imparted to the house of David in the form of a prophetic oracle. It would have affirmed the king's adoption by Yahweh, promised him victory over his enemies 'to the ends of the earth' and a reign everlastingly glorious and secure, endowed with a plenitude of the covenant blessings. The later messianic psalms elaborate on these basic themes (cf. Pss. 2, 45, 72, 89, 110, 132). Thus Israelite prophets, priests and psalmists are inspired to draw on the stereotyped forms of Egyptian protocol in order to formulate the eternal decree of Yahweh's covenant

[1] cf. M. Noth, *Amt und Berufung im Alten Testament*, p. 16

[2] cf. G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, I, 1957, pp. 48–9, referring to S. Herrmann, ' Die Königsnovelle in Agypten u. Israel,' in *Wissenschaftl. Zeitschr. d. Karl-Marx-Univ.*, 1953–4, pp. 51ff.

[3] G. von Rad, 'Das judäische Königsritual,' in *Gesammelte Studien zum Alten Testament*, 1958, pp. 208ff., and R. de Vaux, *Les Institutions de l'Ancien Testament*, pp. 159–60

with David's house. It has been plausibly suggested that the sacred names of Immanuel are 'protocol' names after the Egyptian pattern,[1] and that they recall Yahweh's original promise through Nathan : 'I will make thee a great name, like to the names of the great ones of the earth' (2 Sam. 7:9).

Successive members of the Davidic line would therefore have received at their accession a 'protocol' based on the oracle of Nathan. The terms of the protocol would no doubt have been enlarged upon by the minstrels and prophets attached to their respective courts. At each coronation it would have been foretold in more or less extravagant terms that Yahweh's promise was on the point of being fulfilled in the particular reign just beginning.[2] In this way what we are accustomed to think of as the Messianic ideal would have been formulated.[3] Disappointment followed disappointment as one after another of the historical figures around whom it grew up fell far short of the longed-for fulfilment. At last when the Davidic monarchy as an historic institution was engulfed and lost in the disaster of the exile, only the ideal remained. Yet it remained not as a nostalgic memory but rather as a living hope. The royal protocol given to David's line was Yahweh's promise. *And as sure as Yahweh was faithful, that promise would be fulfilled.* It was utterly unthinkable that Yahweh could fail. So it is that the Messianic ideal, so far from fading and dying out, was actually expanded and intensified after the disappearance of the monarchy, and occupied the religious thought of post-exilic Israel more and more. To be faithful to Yahweh, to trust to His promises, came to mean that attitude of expectation which is expressed in the New Testament formula 'waiting for the consolation of Israel.'

[1] *cf.* R. de Vaux, *Les Institutions de l'Ancien Testament*, pp. 165–6
[2] cf. ibid., p. 169
[3] cf. S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, p. 125, where he defines eschatology as '. . . a doctrine or a complex of ideas about " the last things," which is more or less organically coherent and developed. Every eschatology includes in some form or other a dualistic conception of the course of history, and implies that the present state of things and the present world order will suddenly come to an end and be superseded by another of an essentially different kind. As a rule this new order has the character of a fresh beginning, a *restitutio in integrum*, a return to the origins, without the corruption which subsequently overtook and deformed the original creation. Eschatology also includes the thought that this drama has a universal, cosmic character. . . . It follows that this is not brought about by human or historical forces, or by any immanent evolutionary process. The transformation is definitely catastrophic in character, and is brought about by super-natural, divine, or demonic powers.' Against this background Mowinckel defines the Messiah as '. . . simply the king in this national and religious future kingdom which will one day be established by the miraculous intervention of Yahweh. . . . *The Messiah is the future, eschatological realization of the ideal of kingship*' (pp. 155–6). On this conception cf. de Vaux's just observations (RB, 1958, p. 106) to the effect that if one is to define the term 'messianism' so narrowly, and distinguish it so sharply from the 'future hope,' one ought logically to conclude that there is no messianism at all in the Old Testament.

When Israel was 'consoled' and raised to the world-wide supremacy which was her due, it would be through a son of David, repeating in *cosmic* and *eschatological* terms, the *historical* achievements of his ancestor.

Adherents of the 'History of Tradition' school (on whose work I have heavily relied in the course of this investigation) lay great and entirely justified emphasis on the essentially *complex* nature of Hebrew kingship.[1] One can see how important this is. So many disparate traditions converge upon the figure of the king ; so many divergent functions accumulate about his person. As *guardian, upholder and 'mediator'* of the Covenant (*Bundesmittler*) he is heir to the ancient type of 'institutional' judge, although the significance of this function is transformed in the light of the historical precedent provided by Josiah, the model (at least according to the Deuteronomist tradition) of all 'covenant guardians.'[2] As *saviour of Israel* and conqueror of her enemies he stands directly in the line of the charismatic judges, the leaders in the holy war. Here the figure of David himself towers above all other warrior chiefs. As *guardian of the covenant-shrine and temple* he continues the tradition set by David and Solomon, and inherits, as part of the same tradition, the title of ' priest in the line of Melchisedech' and the elaborate and dramatic expressions of kingship that go with this. In this sphere he acquires a certain position in the cult and, according to the degree of his personal faithfulness to Yahweh's law, becomes a ' channel' of blessing or cursing to all Israel, both the people and the land. All prosperity depends on him, and on his inspired wisdom and righteousness. The prototype for this aspect of the king's functions is, of course, Solomon. Wonderful prosperity and fertility spread throughout the land as a result of his God-given wisdom. But above all, as *adopted son of God*, he is heir to that personal intimacy with Yahweh which David enjoyed. This is the chief gift promised to him in his royal protocol ; he is to be a new David.

Contemporary discussion has perhaps been conducted too much in the sphere of comparative religion. There has been a tendency to talk too much about ' Hebrew kingship' and not enough about ' Hebrew kings.' At all events it is vital to recognise that *kingship meant different things at different periods to different groups within the Israelite society.*[3] Great tensions must have arisen between elements in the office which were ancient and proper to the covenant people, and other elements which were new and borrowed from pagan neighbours. One must take due cognisance of these facts before one can permit oneself any generalisations about ' Hebrew kingship' or ' king ideology.' The

---

[1] cf. M. Noth, ' Gott, König, Volk im Alten Testament,' in *Gesammelte Studien,* pp. 216ff. [2] cf. Kraus, *Gottesdienst in Israel*, pp. 89–90
[3] cf. M. Noth, op. cit., p. 216

Messianic ideal was evolved not in terms of an abstract ideological formula of kingship (there never was such a formula) but with reference to a concrete historical prototype—a king, David. It was the significance which later generations saw in the figures of David, and, to a lesser extent, of Solomon and Josiah, that determined, far more than any ideological considerations, the form of the Messianic hope.

JOSEPH BOURKE, O.P.

Hawkesyard

THE MOST HIGH GOD OF GENESIS 14:18–20

Authors writing on Melchisedech generally remark on the mystery which surrounds this contemporary of Abraham. This is not surprising since his appearances in Holy Scripture are few, brief and mysterious, and apart from the little that we learn of him from the Bible we know nothing about him. His first appearance in the Biblical narrative is abrupt and dramatic (Gen. 14:18–20) ; he is a Canaanite priest-king of Salem, who comes forth to salute Abraham returning from his victory over the Oriental kings. Abraham receives his blessing and pays him tithes, thereby acknowledging the legitimacy of his priesthood despite the fact that Melchisedech is a Canaanite. Only twice more do we meet Melchisedech in the Bible : in Ps. 109 (110):4 and in the Epistle to the Hebrews 5–7, presented unexpectedly as type and figure of the supreme High Priest and King.

Various questions might be discussed about Melchisedech, but perhaps the most intriguing for Old Testament scholars is the title under which he worshipped God. In Gen. 14:18 we are told that ' he was a priest of Most High God ' (*'El 'Elyon*). Genesis obviously understands *'El 'Elyon* as a title of the one true God. Yet Melchisedech did not belong to the clan of Abraham, nor did he, as far as we know, receive a special revelation from God, and consequently we should have expected him to have been a worshipper of some pagan deity, living as he was in a well-attested polytheistic environment. Moreover *'El 'Elyon* as a title for God occurs only once more in the Old Testament, in Ps. 77 (78):35 and perhaps the author of it was influenced in his choice of that title by Gen. 14. Abraham, however, recognised Melchisedech as a priest of God ; otherwise he would not have paid his respects to him. *'El 'Elyon* therefore would appear to be *'El*, the name by which the patriarchs designated God, called here *'Elyon*, the Highest.

Most critics would not agree with this. It is true that in extra-biblical documents 'El and 'Elyon appear as two quite distinct deities ; for example on a stele discovered near Aleppo (dating from the 8th century B.C.) we read *qdm 'el w'alyan*—before 'El and 'Elyon.[1] They were polytheistic deities, and consequently it is not surprising to meet the assertion that Melchisedech was the worshipper of *'Elyon* (or some other deity) and that the author of the narrative in Genesis is guilty of tendentious assimilation and syncretism.

Before dealing with this assertion, however, some preliminary investigation of these two deities is necessary. In the Ugarit documents 'El presides (at least in theory) over the West Semitic pantheon. He is considered the ' wise, the judge and the king ' ; he is the great god of Canaan, which is the ' land of *'El*.' Everything is subject to him, even the other gods (the ' sons of *'El* '), and nothing takes place without his consent.[2] Among the numerous titles which indicate his pre-eminence in the pantheon, those which are reminiscent of the title of *'El 'Elyon* in Gen. 14:19 ' maker of heaven and earth ' are ' Creator of creatures,' [3] ' our Creator *'El*,' [4] and ' Father (i.e. Creator) of man.' [5] Another inscription discovered at Karatepe in Cilicia has ' *'El*, creator of earth.' [6]

We know also that 'El was the name used by the patriarchs to designate God (cf. e.g. Gen. 33:20 ; 46:1–6). It is the oldest name applied to God since it appears only in those texts recognised as the oldest—except where it is used anachronistically. Nevertheless it would be erroneous to assume that the patriarchs borrowed either the name or conception of 'El from the Canaanites who were settled in Palestine on their arrival. Equally erroneous would be the assumption that the pantheon at Ugarit reflected the ' primitive religion ' of the Semites. 'El was the name used by all Semitic peoples (with the exception of the Ethiopians) for ' God,' and therefore would appear to go back to the time before the Semites split up into their various

---

[1] cf. P. S. Ronzevalle, *Mélanges de l'Université de St. Joseph*, 1931, p. 237. Also Pirot-Clamer, *Genèse*, pp. 95 and 258 ; Levi della Vida, ' 'El 'Elyon in Genesis 14, 18–20,' *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXIII, 1944, pp. 1–9.

[2] W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, p. 72 ; *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 231f. ; *JBL*, XLIX, 1940, p. 106. G. E. Wright, *Biblical Archaeology*, p. 106. R. Dussaud, *Les Decouvertes de Ras-Shamra et l'Ancien Testament*, pp. 67–8 ; *Les Religions des Hittites et des Hourrites, des Phéniciens et des Syriens*, p. 360. E. Dhorme, *La Religion des Hébreux Nomades*, pp. 335f. J. W. Jack, *The Ras-Shamra Tablets. Their bearing on the Old Testament*, p. 14. R. Follet, ' El in alveo duarum aquarum,' *VD*, XXXIV, 1956, pp. 28f.

[3] Viroulleaud, *La Legende Phénicienne de Danel*, pp. 102 and 192 ; *Syria*, 1932, plate xxv, col. 2, line 11, p. 121. W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and Religion of Palestine*, p. 87 [4] H. G. May, ' Patriarchal Idea of God,' *JBL*, LX, 1941, p. 114

[5] Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, ' Legend of King Keret,' KRT A, line 35

[6] J. Starcky, *Cahiers Sioniens*, June 1951, p. 25 (117)

nations and tribes, i.e. to at least the fourth millenium. By the time of Ugarit (middle of the second millenium) the ' nature ' of '*El* (like that of the other gods) had evolved considerably, even though he still remained the head of the pantheon.

In the cuneiform texts of the third millenium '*El* appears in the Accadic form of *il* or *ilu*.[1] The etymology is still disputed but probably it is derived from the root '*wl* or '*yl*, which expresses the idea of ' power, primacy or strong ' (*dunamis*).[2] Whether or not *il* or *ilu* was used as a proper name by the Assyro-Babylonians is uncertain. Lagrange was of the opinion that it was, being applied to the supreme god of the Semites who were originally monotheistic.[3] Othes rmaintain that the Ugarit texts are the first in which it appears as a proper name, before which it was purely appellative. At first it probably was an appellative used like *theos* in Greek or *deus* in Latin, having a masculine, feminine and plural and was applied to gods and goddesses alike. However, since the Semites considered *Il* as distinct and superior to all other beings and therefore in some sense unique, it is not surprising to find that in time as the number of deities increased, it was applied to the supreme god, the old god of the Semites before they dispersed throughout the Fertile Crescent. In *Il* or '*El* was all that was divine and so the name belonged to him as his own. This would explain the fact that '*El* was used in all the Semitic languages and was never limited to any particular place or people (like *Ba'al*), i.e. was never considered a local deity and also would explain the preference for it in theophoric names among the various Semitic peoples.[4] In the Old Testament it is used both appellatively (Gen. 49:25 ; 1 Sam. 2:3 ; Exod. 20:5 ; 34:14) and as a proper name for God (Gen. 33:20 ; 46:3).

As already pointed out '*Elyon* appears as a deity distinct from '*El*. Before the discovery of the stele mentioned above we already had an indication of 'Elyon's existence from Philo of Byblos, who claimed to pass on the testimony of Sanchunyathon, a Phoenician historian of about 600 B.C. He stated that the Phoenicians had a god ' *Elioun kaloumenos hupsistos* '—Elioun who is called most high.[5] Incidentally *hupsistos* is the LXX translation of '*Elyon*. In the Phoenician pantheon given by Philo, *Elioun* is not only distinct but also superior and a

---

[1] M.-J. Lagrange, *Études sur les Religions semitiques*, p. 76 ; J. Starcky, op. cit., p. 25 ; Pirot-Clamer, *Genèse*, p. 96
[2] E. Dhorme, *La Religion des Hébreux Nomades*, p. 335 ; M.-J. Lagrange, op. cit., p. 79 ; W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, p. 72
[3] op. cit., pp. 77–9
[4] P. van Imschoot, *Théologie de l'Ancien Testament*, pp. 8–9
[5] Eusebius (*Prae. Evang.* 1:10) quotes Philo who quotes Sanchunyathon. cf. Albright, *JBL*, LX, 1941, p. 106.

progenitor of 'El.[1] Nevertheless Philo's Elioun would appear to be derived from 'ly (or 'Alyy) which occurs twice at Ugarit as a title for Ba'al in the Keret epic.[2] This title, indicating that Ba'al is 'exalted,' is again reminiscent of ' Most High ' in Gen. 14:18.[3]

Consequently authors are not agreed on the precise identity and age of 'Elyon ; some maintain that he is an old god supplanted by 'El as head of the pantheon ; others, probably more correctly, maintain that he is a later god (Ba'al) who assumed the ascendancy over 'El— at least in practice, since he was the god of rain and so controlled the vegetation and consequently played an important role in the eyes of the people.

In the light of this data we must try to determine what Melchisedech understood by 'El 'Elyon. A solution to the problem may well be impossible, since Genesis tells us so little and the sources outside Genesis throw no direct light on it. The varied response to the question given by modern authors is dependent to a great extent on their conception of patriarchal religion. Those who designate the patriarchs as polytheistic and syncretistic have little difficulty in seeing in 'El 'Elyon of Gen. 14 a pagan deity or deities to whom Abraham paid homage ; those of them who admit the historicity of the narrative see here a confirmation of that view. On the other hand those who uphold the strict monotheism of the patriarchs see in 'El 'Elyon the One True God, worshipped by Melchisedech and recognised by Abraham. This is evidently what the author of Genesis wishes to convey and is how both Jewish and Catholic tradition have understood 'El 'Elyon.[4] Perhaps, however, the question does not resolve itself along these lines—or rather agreement among authors is not to be sought along these lines.[5]

Many critics see in 'El 'Elyon not one but two deities.[6] 'El 'Elyon corresponds to no actual deity but is a combination of two of the principle deities in the Canaanite pantheon—'El, who by Philo is put in close connection with earth (Ge was his mother) and 'Elyon who had a heavenly character. The merging of these two into one gives

[1] cf. R. Dussaud who gives the pantheon as described by Philo in Les Religions des Hittites et des Hourrites, des Phéniciens et des Syriens, p. 358 ; he disagrees with Philo's identification of Elioun. For discussion cf. also Levi della Vida, in JBL, LXIII, 1944, pp. 1–9.

[2] J. B. Pritchard, Ancient Near Eastern Texts, KRT C. III, lines 5–7, p. 148 ; W. F. Albright, CBQ, VII, 1945, p. 31

[3] cf. Viroulleaud, ' Le Roi Keret et son Fils,' Syria, XXII, 1941, p. 200

[4] Bardy, 'Melchisedech dans la Tradition Patristique,' in RB, XXXIII, 1926, pp. 496f.

[5] Nowhere in the Old Testament is it explicitly asserted that the patriarchs were strictly monotheistic, but the whole tone of the narratives gives the impression that they were. cf. A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture, 105bc.

[6] R. Dussaud, op. cit., p. 359 ; Levi della Vida, op. cit. ; J. Morgenstern, The Book of Genesis, ad loc. ; R. J. Tournay, RB, LVI, 1949, p. 49 ; Chaine, La Livre de la Genèse, ad loc.

'El 'Elyon a universalistic character not possessed by any of the actual deities in the pantheon ; he is the ' creator of heaven and earth.' This universalistic character according to these critics is what is intended by the author of Gen. 14:18–20, who is considered to be either exilic or postexilic. His intention would therefore be to project the mono-theistic and universalistic character of Yahweh of his time back to the patriarchal period, making Him the God of the patriarchs and at the same time insinuating that He was the God always worshipped in the Holy City.

Much of this is pure phantasy, seeking as it does to impose on ancient mythology a logical system which it never possessed. There is absolutely no reason for the assertion that 'El 'Elyon never was an actual deity but was the result of theological speculation.[1] Moreover the whole hypothesis is based on late conceptions of 'El and 'Elyon related by Philo which have nothing to do with the period in question. The pantheon too as described by Philo must now be considered ideal rather than real at any given period.[2] The Ugarit texts in no way limit 'El to the role of ' god of earth ' alone ; he is the Supreme God, above all things, ' creator of creatures,' living at a great distance while his dominion is universal. On the other hand 'Elyon's existence as a distinct deity is extremely doubtful in the Ugarit period, where 'Elyon appears to be a title of Ba'al the Storm God, who does not have the heavenly character demanded by the above hypothesis.

However the fact that their hypothesis is based on late conceptions of 'El and 'Elyon in no way disturbs these authors, since they consider the narrative to be a late composition. For them the whole of chapter 14 is tendentious, seeking to glorify the patriarch Abraham as a warlike hero. The encounter with Melchisedech, whether it be considered as part of the original narrative or an interpolation into it, is also considered tendentious, the work of the Jerusalem priests wishing to vindicate their right to tithes by appealing to a supposed incident in the life of Abraham.

Therefore before any solution to the question of how Melchisedech imagined 'El 'Elyon is possible—in fact before the question can be posited—the antiquity and historicity of the narrative must be estab-lished. It is now universally acknowledged that chapter 14 does not belong to any of the three main sources of Genesis, but in itself this is no indication of high antiquity. De Vaux has aptly refuted the hypercritical and arbitrary speculations of those who deny the historicity of chapter 14 and has shown its historical character and likelihood.[3]

---

[1] cf. W. F. Albright, *CBQ*, VII, 1945, p. 31
[2] P. Nautin, ' Valeur Documentaire de l'Histoire Phénicienne,' *RB*, LVI, 1949, p. 577
[3] ' Les Decouvertes Modernes et les Patriarches Hébreux,' *RB*, LV, 1948, p. 327

However, he explicitly excludes the Melchisedech pericope from his discussion, as demanding special treatment.

It is argued that the Melchisedech scene (vv. 18-20) is an interpolation since it interrupts the narrative of vv. 1-17 and 21-4.[1] However, it must be considered part of the original composition of the author since 'El 'Elyon in the mouth of Abraham in v. 22 is unintelligible if isolated from what has preceded in vv. 18-20. In favour of the antiquity of the content, no more cogent argument can be had than the fact that Judaism of the exilic or post-exilic period would not have invented and inserted an account where a Canaanite non-Israelite figured as a priest of God and to whom Abraham, the father of the race, paid his respects. The content therefore argues to the antiquity of the narrative and indeed to the antiquity of the whole chapter of which it is an integral part.[2]

Assuming therefore the antiquity and historicity of the narrative we may now proceed to the 'El 'Elyon of Melchisedech. Taken as it stands, 'El 'Elyon might conceivably mean the ' god 'Elyon ' or the ' god that is 'Elyon.' [3] 'Elyon would then be the god of Melchisedech. However, this is unlikely on account of the doubtful existence of such a god at this period and because Abraham would not have reverenced and honoured any other deity but 'El, the One True God, at least not after his vocation by 'El.

An opinion which merits more serious consideration is that which sees in 'El 'Elyon a designation of the god Salem, who would undoubtedly be the original tutelar deity of the city, the deity whence the city derived its name. The earliest name for Jerusalem is Urusalim, occurring in the Amarna letters. The first element uru (Hebrew yeru) is from the root wrw or yrw (Hebrew yarah) meaning to ' establish ' or to ' found.' [4] Hence Jerusalem would be ' the foundation of Salem.' The existence of this deity is attested in the Ugarit texts where he is one of the numerous progeny of 'El.[5] Naturally then we should expect Salem to be venerated in the city of his foundation and its priest-king to be a priest of Salem.[6]

It is difficult however to see how the titles ' Most High God ' and ' Creator of heaven and earth ' could be attributed to Salem, a minor

---

[1] In v. 17 the king of Sodom comes out to meet Abraham, but it is not until v. 21 that we learn of his object in doing so. Melchisedech is not mentioned either before or after vv. 18-20.

[2] The author may have used different traditions in compiling his narrative.

[3] cf. Chaine, ad loc. ; Dussaud, op. cit., p. 359

[4] E. Dhorme, La Religion des Hébreux Nomades, p. 120 ; J. Lewy, RHR, CX, 1934, pp. 50ff. ; L. H. Vincent, RB, LVIII, 1951, p. 364 ; W. F. Albright, JPOS, 1935, p. 218, n. 78, considers uru as an optative ' let Salem found.'

[5] Viroulleaud, Syria, XIV, 1933, pp. 128ff.

[6] This is the opinion defended by Lewy (loc. cit.) and by Vincent (loc. cit.).

deity in the pantheon. The text does not say that Melchisedech was a priest of Salem, nor does it imply it in any way. Still more difficult to understand is how Abraham, if Melchisedech was a priest of this deity, could honour and venerate *Salem* by assimilating him to his own God. Such syncretism and assimilation would be unparalleled and against the whole tenor of Genesis. On the other hand *Salem* may have been venerated in Jerusalem even at this time along with *'El 'Elyon*, just as at Ugarit *Ba'al* was worshipped and enthroned with *'El*.

The multiplicity of titles given to *'El* at Ugarit and in other documents which have come to light, invites us to see in *'Elyon* another such title rather than another deity. Although this title ' Most High' has not been revealed as a title of *'El* in any of the sources, it must be admitted that it would be a very apt one for the supreme God. The other title ' Creator of heaven and earth' would confirm this interpretation, since *'El* was the ' creator of creatures' and ' our creator *'El*' at Ugarit. *'El* as we have seen was the name used by the patriarchs for God, and when Melchisedech blessed Abraham in the name of *'El 'Elyon* his thoughts were obviously centred on the God (*'El*) of Abraham, who alone could be considered as having accorded Abraham victory. *'El 'Elyon* therefore in vv. 18–20 was *'El*, the God of Abraham, and Melchisedech was his priest. Abraham then could honour Melchisedech without in any way compromising his own faith in God.

In Genesis *'El* is given other titles too, e.g. *'El Shadday* in 17:1; 28:3; 35:11; 43:14; 48:3; 49:25 (*Deus Omnipotens, Sublimis, Excelsus*); *'El 'ôlam* in 21:23 (*Deus Aeternus*); *'El Ro'i* in 16:13 (*Deus Visionis*). Whatever the derivation of the title *Shadday*[1] it may well be synonymous with *'Elyon*, both indicating that *'El* lived ' up above' in the heights. ' Most High' would not then be a superlative of comparison (highest of many) but an absolute title suggestive of God's sublimity and transcendence.

It would be an unwarranted deduction from this to conclude that Abraham identified his God *'El* with the Canaanite *'El*, as known from the extra-biblical sources.[2] Although frequently asserted such a conclusion would be against the whole tone, historical and theological, of the patriarchal history contained in Genesis, the purpose of which is to show the uniqueness, superiority and transcendence of God and his dealings with the Chosen People.

On the other hand we cannot attribute to Melchisedech the conception of God that Abraham had through revelation, even though in this encounter it is Melchisedech who takes the initiative in identifying his God with that of Abraham. Genesis tells us nothing more than

[1] cf. W. F. Albright, *JBL*, LIV, 1935, pp. 180ff. ; De Vaux, *La Genèse*, p. 86
[2] De Vaux, *La Genèse*, pp. 33–4 ; W. F. Albright, art. cit., p. 191

that—it is concerned with Abraham and not with Melchisedech, except in his relation to Abraham. Objectively, however, we have a profession of faith in the true God by Melchisedech. How Melchisedech came to the knowledge of God we can only conjecture. From an historical point of view it is impossible to maintain that Melchisedech was a monotheist in the strict sense. The fact that he worshipped God under the title of ' Most High ' is no indication that he considered Him the only God. The Egyptians and Babylonians had a ' highest god ' also, but were not monotheists. The title might easily indicate the contrary to be true. Considering the environment Melchisedech quite probably believed in the existence of the other deities worshipped around him. However he was a priest of 'El, whom he identified with the God of Abraham, and being a priest he would be monolatrous. From the fact that Abraham accepted the identification and paid his respects to Melchisedech, we may justifiably conclude that Melchisedech had a higher appreciation of God than his contemporaries.

From his name he appears to have been a Semite. This is not surprising, since we know that Palestine during the twentieth and nineteenth centuries was invaded by a Semitic people, the Amorites, a nomadic barbaric people from the Arabian desert.[1] Before this Palestine had been under Egyptian domination, but during the XIIth Dynasty (1991–1792) that dominion was restricted to the coastal zone and was only virtual in the interior hilly country, due to these Semitic invaders, as we know from the Egyptian Execration Texts of this period. These invaders set up small city-states, among which was probably Jerusalem. In Gen. 10:16 they are enumerated among the people of Canaan. In 14:7 they are among those defeated by the Oriental kings in southern Palestine. Abraham when he pursued the kings took Amorites as his allies (cf. 14:14, 24). In all probability then Melchisedech was an Amorite.

There are several indications that Abraham himself belonged to this ethnic group. The time of his entry into Canaan coincides with their invasion. The names of several of Abraham's ancestors were also names of towns in the region of Haran, a centre of the Amorite kingdom and the homeland of Abraham. The names of Abraham and Jacob are also Amorite names. The later Hebrews remembered their connection with this people (cf. Gen. 24:25 ; 31:18–24 ; Deut. 26:5 ; Ez. 16:3).

If then Melchisedech was an Amorite, of the same Semitic stock as Abraham, there would be nothing surprising in the fact that he worshipped 'El, the ancient God of the Semites, whom he identified with

---

[1] cf. G. E. Wright, *Biblical Archaeology*, pp. 41ff. ; L. H. Vincent, *RB*, LVIII, 1951, p. 361 ; *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*, 57d and 59g

the God of Abraham. We know that the Amorites did worship *'El*.[1] There would be no question of syncretism and assimilation on the part of Abraham such as modern scholars often suggest. Significant in this respect is the fact that when God called Abraham (Gen. 12) He did not explain who He was, nor did Abraham inquire, as did Moses at a later date. The whole narrative proceeds as though Abraham already knew and recognised God. *'El* was the God of Abraham's ancestors, even though they had worshipped other gods besides *'El* (cf. Jos. 24:2, 14). Melchisedech's position may therefore have been analogous to that of Abraham before the latter's vocation.

Unless some direct evidence is brought to light on this figure of the Old Testament, he must remain shrouded in mystery, even though he must, at the same time, rank as one of the greatest figures in the Old Testament because of the role he was elected to play as type of the Supreme High Priest and King : ' consider how great this man is, to whom also the patriarch Abraham gave tithes.'

T. HANLON

Drygrange

THE KEYS OF GOD'S HOUSEHOLD

O God, with your judgment endow the king,
and with your justice, the king's son.
He shall govern your people with justice,
and your afflicted ones with judgment. (Ps. 71:1-2)

The narrative of Christ's choosing Peter as the Rock of his Church (Matt. 16:13–20) belongs to the larger section (13:53–18:35) which outlines the form of the Church as the beginning of the everlasting kingdom of the heavens. In fact the account fits into the narrative part of this section (13:53–17:27), of which Jesus' transfiguration as the Christ and giver of the new law is the climax. Christ entrusts his messianic authority over the people of God to Simon whom he has called ' Peter.' The familiar narrative, which Matthew places in the district of Caesarea Philippi, tells us both that Jesus received Peter's profession that he is the Christ the Son of God and that he made the apostle, already promised the title ' Peter ' (John 1:42), the rock in the foundation of his Church. And Peter is not only made the Rock, but he also receives ' the keys of the kingdom of heaven.' Peter, singled

---

[1] J. Starcky, *Cahiers Sioniens*, June 1951, p. 28

out to rule in Christ's name and charged with the care of God's household, is given the Christian stewardship from 'the Son of the living God.'

We read in the Old Testament that when Eliakim was given authority the keys were given to him. God promises the authority, 'I will place on his shoulder the key of the house of David ; he shall open, and none shall shut ; and he shall shut and none shall open' (Is. 22:22). This type receives its fullness in the new covenant, for the risen Christ proclaims, 'I am before all, I am at the end of all, and I live. I, who underwent death, am alive to endless ages, and I hold the keys of death and hell' (Apoc. 1:17–18).

Jesus' words to Peter, 'I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' refer, therefore, to this power which Jesus possesses as the master of the kingdom and the Lord of all. Christ is the conqueror of sin and death ; he is the liberator who frees mankind from hell, because he is the well-loved Son in whose hands the Father has placed everything (John 3:35). After he had risen he told his disciples, 'All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me' (Matt. 28:18). To Peter he delegated not only the power 'to bind and to loose,' that is, full authority in all matters necessary for the well-being of the Christian commonwealth, but also the responsibility of acting in his name, for what is done on earth is so done in heaven.

Peter governs the community of Christ's redeemed, since he is the Rock of God's people and the keeper of the Lord's keys. When Jesus ascended to his Father, he left to Peter the power of the keys which he had won (Apoc. 1:18 ; 3:7). He built upon Peter the Church first founded on the rock that is Christ (1 Cor. 10:4), and he gave to Peter the sheep which he saved in love (John 21:15–18).

The power which Jesus has comes from the actuality of his messiahship ; he inherits this authority because of his Old Testament lineage. Within the framework of the Gospels, Jesus' words and signs are notes which reveal him as the messiah, promised in the Old Testament. His mission is one of fulfilment as well as one of re-creation ; his mission, moreover, appeals to prophecies and types, in the light of his reconciling work. All authority in heaven and on earth has been put in his hands, because he receives the authority given by God to the messianic line. Within this line the Christ inherited and brought to new glory the power entrusted to the tribe of Juda and its crowned hero, David.

The oracles attributed to the patriarch Jacob in the poem of Gen. 49 come from an era when the tribe of Juda had special prominence in Israel's history. The final form of the poem was made no later than David's reign, but many of its elements date from an earlier period.

At any rate, Jacob's sons in the poem stand for the tribes which later bore their names.

Juda is pictured as the primate and the power among the tribes of Israel, and this destiny of Juda is built upon the promise which God gave the chosen people ; it is, in fact, a further specification of the great blessing God gave to Abraham, ' In you shall all the nations of the earth be blessed ' (Gen. 12:3). This blessing narrows the fundamental promise of victory proclaimed in the *protoevangelion* for mankind's salvation against the enemy Satan (Gen. 3:15). The favour conferred on Abraham was continued, and in the narrative of Isaac's sacrifice the promise of blessing is repeated (Gen. 22:18). Next the promise is laid upon Isaac, ' I will fulfil the oath which I swore to your father Abraham ; . . . in your descendants all the nations of the earth shall be blessed ' (Gen. 26:3–4). Later God's constant care was for Jacob, whom He would not forsake till the promise of blessing be fulfilled (Gen. 28:14–15), till the promise be given to the line of Jacob's son Juda.

> A lion's whelp is Juda ;
>> he crouches and crouches as a lion, and who will disturb him?
> The sceptre shall not depart from Juda,
>> nor the staff from between his feet,
> Until he comes to whom it belongs.
>> To him shall be the obedience of the nations (Gen. 49:9–10).

Accordingly the tribe of Juda possesses the authority and the might, and the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob has chosen Juda as the regal family of the messianic power. The royal sceptre passed to the tribe of Juda when David, ' the son of an Ephrathite of Bethlehem in Juda ' (1 Sam. 17:12), was anointed king by Samuel (1 Sam. 16:13) ; later ' the men of Juda came, and there they anointed David king over the house of Juda ' (2 Sam. 2:4) ; and finally the tribe of Juda ruled in the person of David when all the elders of Israel ' anointed David king over Israel ' (2 Sam. 5:3). David ruled with the sceptre and the staff of Juda.

Through Nathan God promised David that the messiah would be his heir (2 Sam. 7:1f.). When David wanted to build a house for the Lord, it was God who gave David an everlasting house for salvation. ' And your house and your kingdom shall be made sure for ever before me ; your throne shall be established for ever ' (v. 16). The promise made David's line permanent on the throne of Israel ; it also made the messiah the son of David, for David's blood would rule for ever through the chosen descendant (Is. 7:14 ; Mic. 5:1–2 ; Acts 2:30).

Moreover, the author of Ps. 88 in his prayer to God praises the divine steadfastness regarding David and his sealed kingship.

> I will not violate my covenant ;
>> the promise of my lips I will not alter.
> Once, by my holiness, have I sworn ;
>> I will not be false to David.
> His posterity shall continue for ever,
>> and his throne shall be like the sun before me (vv. 35-7).

David was the Lord's servant whose rule as ' shepherd of the people Israel' (2 Sam. 5:2) was a foreshadowing of the eternal rule of ' the prince of shepherds ' (1 Pet. 5:4), the Lord Jesus. David as the great king of God's flock was more than a type of the messiah, because Jesus is descended in the blood line of the Davidic house. So important is this lineage for Jesus' messiahship that Matthew opens, ' A record of the origin of Jesus Christ, the son of David.' Also, the Christ is ' the son of Abraham,' the heir in whom all the nations of the earth are blessed according to God's oath to Abraham. David is descended from Abraham, Isaac and Jacob through Juda, and Christ, in turn, is of the tribe of Juda from David. Jesus is the messiah who sits on ' the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob eternally ; his kingdom shall never have an end ' (Luke 1:32-3). On Christ the Father has laid the sceptre of Juda in the new Israel and the crown of David in the eternal Jerusalem.

The Lord Jesus is the king-messiah of God ; he has received an everlasting throne with authority over the community of the redeemed which, because of Christ's work, is the new Israel, ' a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a consecrated nation, God's own people ' (1 Pet. 2:9 ; Exod. 19:5-6). He is David's royal son, the king ' who is all holiness and truth ; who bears the key of David, so that none may shut when he opens, none open when he shuts ' (Apoc. 3:7). He has inherited Davidic power ; he is God's king of the messianic promise. As God's king he has set Peter as viceroy over God's household with the Davidic key of authority to govern, by admitting or excluding, by binding or loosing in the sacred name of the risen Jesus whose name is the full power of heaven on earth, the holiness of Jesus the Lord (Phil. 2:9-11 ; Is. 45:23).

The dominion symbolised by the keys of Christ entrusted to Peter embraces the full commission to teach, rule and sanctify, which Jesus gave to his Church, the fulfilment of the kingdom of Israel. When Jesus laid the keys of this new kingdom in Peter's dedicated hands, he established the Church strong in heavenly power to do all that leads

the mystical body from the kingdom on earth to the heavenly Jerusalem, 'God's tabernacle pitched among men' (Apoc. 21:3).

The overwhelming conviction of the Church throughout its Spirit-filled history is that when the body of Christ acts so does its head, for God has re-created mankind in the Spirit as 'all one person in Jesus Christ' (Gal. 3:28). The works of the Church done by the Christian assembly on earth have the power of Christ, since the Church has the Davidic keys of Jesus; heaven is its guaranteed possession so that all acts of Christ's community take effect both before the Father and in the souls of men. The Church acts through the authority of the one Christ who 'has entered heaven itself, where he now appears in God's sight on our behalf' (Heb. 9:24).

Though Peter alone is the keeper of the keys and consequently the vicar of Christ, the incarnate Word so left in the Church the full power of the keys that it has total competence to bind and to loose in the name of the one king, prophet and priest. This Church, the mystery of Christ, has the messianic keys by which it rules, teaches and sanctifies as the royal house of God, the prophetic college of Christ, and the priestly temple of the Spirit. This authority is given in the Spirit of peace, because the mission of reconciliation with which Jesus entered the world is now given to the Church (John 20:19–23). Just as Jesus was the great apostle of the Father, 'the one sent' by God, so now the Church is Christ's legate sharing in the apostolic mission of reconciliation for the world. This mission was placed in the Church to be exercised through the public and apostolic ministry for the good of Christian religion and of the Catholic commonwealth.

The keys give the Church the same mission with regard to reconciling mankind to God precisely because the Church is the body through which the glorified Christ acts to bring about daily reconciliation. The body of Christ works not only to reconcile those who are spiritually dead to its head or separated from his members, but also to strengthen the bond of love between Christ and his members, all of whom are attacked by the enemy of peace, the gates of hell. The mission of reconciliation is uppermost among the works of the Church, because its head is mediator of the new and saving covenant which unites all in Christ to the Father. The Church has the Davidic keys of Christ for the profit of the redeemed world, but also for the strong life of the household of faith by uniting member to member and body to head in love.

Christ, by making Peter the keeper of the keys, so brings power to the whole Church that it shares in the messianic power of the new and eternal David. The Church inherits the pre-eminence of Juda and the royalty of David for the divine purpose of sharing the love of

Christ and the peace of God. This regal authority is a testament of love left by Christ to his Church and to all mankind ; the Davidic power of the Lord's household proclaims the holiness of God and of His Gospel. Jesus, the son of David, gave that supreme power to the Church that it might be Christ's kingdom, strong by the might of the lion of Juda.

FREDERICK R. SWALLOW

St Charles College
    Catonsville

BOOK REVIEWS

James Killgallon and Gerard Weber, *Christ in Us.* Instructions in the Catholic Faith. Sheed and Ward, London and New York 1959. pp. 302. 6s.

The seventh of the *Canterbury Books* was previously published in the United States of America under the title *Life in Christ,* and it is a book of instructions on the Catholic Faith for adults, written in the traditional catechism form of question and answer, but in such a way as to avoid the excessively stereotyped formulas which are usually associated with catechisms. The book is divided into five parts : the gift of life, Christ the life, the Church the Body of Christ, growth in the divine life and the commandments of God. The question of the order in which the truths of Faith are to be presented is of great moment to modern catechists, and this book begins with Jesus Christ ; and since, on the human side, the first consideration is happiness, then the first question reads : ' Does Jesus Christ promise happiness to those who love him ? ' After five questions on this theme the authors pass, perhaps too abruptly, to the study of God, the Father of Jesus Christ and of all men. Then they return to Jesus Christ, the giver of the new life. This latter section seems oddly placed, since after it we return to God the creator of the world and of man, the fall, and the preparation for the redeemer, before we reach once more a considera- tion of Jesus Christ the God-man. Here we consider our Lord's birth and his role as the supreme teacher before we arrive at a study of the redemption. Surely the redemption should come first, since it is in the light of our Lord's redeeming death and resurrection that the Scriptures invite us to consider him more closely ? The Church as the Body of Christ is given a long and satisfying treatment, and it is perhaps here more than anywhere that the difference of the modern presentation is realised.

There is one other striking difference which is of particular interest: the Scriptures are treated as an integral part of the Faith and abundantly quoted. ' One of the chief aims of this catechism is to help those who study it to become familiar with the inspired word of God, the Holy Scriptures. The many scriptural references and texts which are contained herein are meant to be studied in connection with the lessons in which they appear' (p. 9). This is a most commendable feature of this catechism and will prove very helpful. Long quotations are given and they are well chosen. There are also many questions devoted to the Bible, designed to tell us in what it consists, why it is so important and how it should be read. These questions, it is true, are somewhat strangely scattered about the book, and not every answer is satisfactory. Thus for instance the question ' What is the Old Testament ? ' has the answer ' The Old Testament is the collection of the sacred books of the Jews which tell the story of their relationship with God ' (p. 45). But for the omission of ' their ' before God, it might well be the answer to a question put by a student of comparative religion instead of by a Christian, who in gratitude to God for the redemption is vitally interested in all God's efforts to save. Unfortunately we have the same statement later, though with the welcome addition of ' inspired ': ' The Old Testament is the collection of inspired writings which comprise the sacred books of the Jewish religion ' (p. 123). The question ' Why ought we Christians to read the Old Testament ? ' is not asked, perhaps not surprisingly in view of these descriptions of it. But on the other hand there is the following statement : ' The Jews, therefore, are our spiritual ancestors. Christianity is the Jewish religion brought to its fulfilment in Christ and opened up to the whole world' (p. 44). It is a pity that this is not stressed.

Along with the Bible the Liturgy is given a far more important place than hitherto. The liturgical practices of the Church are described in detail, and in such a way that they have the pedagogical effect which is their true *raison d'être*. This book will prove most useful to those who have the difficult task of instructing converts, and should be a welcome addition to the list of religious text-books for schools.

T. WORDEN

Dom Gaspar Lefebvre, o.s.b., *L'Esprit de Dieu dans la Sainte Liturgie*, no. 107 of the collection ' *Je sais, je crois,*' *Encyclopédie du catholique au XXème siècle*. Librairie Arthème Fayard, Paris 1958. pp. 125. 350 *fr.*

The work of the veteran Liturgist Dom Lefebvre, of the abbey of St André, Bruges, is best known from his admirable edition of the Daily Missal, which has been published in six languages. He has written many other works designed to promote the Liturgical Apostolate. This latest essay, then, has the weight of well-established authority, and can be accepted with confidence.

In the first chapter Dom Lefebvre gives a comprehensive definition of Liturgy, which he then explains fully, point by point. What he writes is happily familiar enough nowadays, above all from the encyclical *Mediator Dei* ; but his treatment is admirably clear, and insistent on the inner meaning and purpose of the Liturgy : the continuation by the Church, animated by the Holy Spirit, of the work of Christ, High Priest and Redeemer, by means of her public and official cult in prayer, ceremony and other sensible signs.

That the activity of the Holy Spirit is of supreme importance in the Liturgy is apparent from all our earliest statements of Christian revelation in the New Testament itself. . . . Dom Lefebvre cites the texts, numerous and compelling. The six chapters, then, which form the main part of this book, are an examination of the Church's Liturgy (in the narrower sense), to show both the nature of the Holy Spirit's activity and how this is presented to the faithful. He takes us through the ' cycles ' of the Liturgical Year, the framework of his exposition, as it must be of our communal worship and growth in the Church. The Old and New Testaments ; the Church's own formulas of prayer ; the comments of the Fathers, are all judiciously quoted. Between the chapter dealing with Easter to Pentecost, and that which treats of the period after Pentecost, the author inserts his examination of the Liturgy of the Sacraments. This is necessarily brief, but of course essential to the general theme, and again written with the economy of the master.

A final chapter discusses devotion to the Holy Spirit—this once more is based on Liturgical texts (e.g. the *Veni Creator Spiritus,* the hymn of Terce, the fine collects of the octave of Pentecost). A brief conclusion summarises the purpose of the whole book.

' The Liturgy is therefore a school in which, under the guidance of the Church, we learn, among other lessons concerning the Holy Spirit, the role that he plays in the great drama of the Redemption, all that we owe to him, and in what manner we ought to honour him

and pray to him.' It is the work of the Holy Spirit to effect in the world of souls a new creation.

The bibliography to this short treatise mentions only three authors who have written in English, and the only Englishman of the three is a non-Catholic. We must admit our lack of material for the general reader. All the more reason to welcome this book itself, which anyone who reads French will find a most practical help to sound devotion through sound knowledge. It is also very good to know that the amazingly comprehensive series—the list is given here, and it runs to 150 volumes—of which this book is one item, is already being advertised in an English translation. At 7s 6d a volume we are promised a scholarly summary of the whole field of Catholic thought, including subjects as diverse as mysticism and the Christian judgment on the cinema. If all the volumes come up to the excellence of the one under review we shall have a Catholic encyclopedia of very great worth indeed. I might just add that the print and general lay-out of this book are first-rate. Long past are the days when we opened our French theological books with something of a groan !

J. L. ALSTON

John L. McKenzie, s.j., *The Two-Edged Sword*. An Interpretation of the Old Testament. Geoffrey Chapman, London 1959. pp. 317. 24s.

This English edition is completely identical with the American publication which we reviewed in *Scripture*, 1957, pp. 92–4. It has been received with great enthusiasm, and we wish to take this opportunity of reiterating our appreciation for a book which has done more than any other Catholic work in English to create a sane and balanced appreciation of the Old Testament. This book, along with Charlier's *The Christian Approach to the Bible* [1] which Fr McKenzie recommends in his bibliography, will satisfy the needs of the majority of our readers if they wish to study the Old Testament, provided of course they have an accurate translation of the text.

T. WORDEN

[1] cf. *Scripture*, 1958, pp. 122–5

BOOKS RECEIVED

(The mention of books in this list neither implies nor precludes subsequent review)

La Bible de Jérusalem, 43 separate volumes. Les éditions du Cerf, Paris 1958 and 1959. The following fascicules are now added to those listed in *Scripture*, XI (April 1959), p. 64 : *Les Nombres*, trad. Cazelles, pp. 160, 600 fr. *Le Livre de Josué*, trad. Abel, introd. et notes Du Buit, pp. 112, 470 fr. *Judith. Esther*, trad. Barucq, pp. 135, n.p.s. *Les Actes des Apôtres*, trad. Cerfaux-Dupont, pp. 220 + one map, n.p.s. *Les Épîtres aux Corinthiens*, trad. Osty (3e ed.), pp. 120, n.p.s. *Les Épîtres aux Galates et aux Romains*, trad. Lyonnet, pp. 138, n.p.s.

Andrea Lazzarini, *Pope John XXIII*, Herder and Herder Inc., New York, & Thomas Nelson and Sons, Edinburgh 1959. pp. 145, 12s 6d.

Paul van K. Thomson, *Why I am a Catholic*. Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, Edinburgh 1959. pp. 204, 21s.

D. W. Gooding, *The Account of The Tabernacle*, Translation and textual problems of the Greek Exodus. Cambridge University Press 1959. pp. 114, 22s 6d.

F. J. Sheed, *Reading for Catholic Parents*, revised edition. Sheed and Ward, London 1959. pp. 40, 2s.

Paul Gaechter, s.j., *Petrus und seine Zeit*. Tyrolia-Verlag, Innsbruck 1958. pp. 480, $125, DM 22, Schw. Frs. 22.

George H. Tavard, *Holy Writ or Holy Church*, The Crisis of the Protestant Reformation. Burns & Oates, London 1959. pp. 250, 30s.

The Shorter Knox Bible, An Abridgement of the Old Testament as translated by Mgr Ronald A. Knox, and edited by Leonard Johnston. Burns & Oates and Mac-Millan & Co. Ltd, London 1958. pp. 413 + 2 maps.

'This book is meant to be a typical sample of what the complete Bible looks like ; so that, although it is so much shorter, it should give a true idea of the Bible as a whole.' It must be noted that it consists of excerpts from the Old Testament alone.

Romano Guarini, *Prayers from Theology*, tr. Richard Newnham. Herder and Herder, New York, Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, Edinburgh and London 1959. pp. 62, 7s 6d.

Peter Lippert, *The Jesuits*, A Self-Portrait. Tr. John Murray. Herder and Herder, New York, Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, Edinburgh and London 1959. pp. 131, 12s 6d.

Maurice Zundel, *In Search of the Unknown God*. Tr. Margaret Clark. Herder and Herder, New York, Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, Edinburgh and London 1959. pp. 195, 18s.

Josef Stierli (ed.), *Heart of the Saviour*, A Symposium on Devotion to the Sacred Heart. Herder and Herder, New York, Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, Edinburgh and London 1959. pp. 268, 25s.

Alfred Wikenhauser, *New Testament Introduction*. Tr. Joseph Cunningham. Herder and Herder, New York, Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, Edinburgh and London 1959. pp. 580, 50s.

Neues Testament, übersetzt u. erklärt von Otto Karrer, neubearbeitete Auflage, Verlag Ars Sacra Josef Müller, München 1959. pp. 820 + 2 maps, 12 × 17 cm., DM 11.80.

e Sacred
dinburgh

Herder
on 1959.

e, Verlag
M 11.80.